

Message

From: Jim Kolotouros [REDACTED]@google.com]
Sent: 6/6/2019 8:22:50 PM
To: Sameer Samat [REDACTED]@google.com]
CC: Christopher Li [REDACTED]@google.com]; Jamie Rosenberg [REDACTED]@google.com]; Tian Lim [REDACTED]@google.com]
Subject: Re: samsung next steps

I want to be mindful of Hirosh's feedback. So I think the formal proposal back should focus on what amount of Samsung Pay integrations/collaboration is required for us to get better alignment on IAP. If they say that "no amount of Samsung Pay integration makes up for what you are asking us to do", we then volunteer 2 of Hiroshi's ideas (in my opinion): either i) revenue share on hardware business, or ii) license fee where their IAP is in place on a device...

how does that sound?

thanks.

On Thu, Jun 6, 2019 at 11:53 AM Sameer Samat <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
 + tian

Got it. So is the next step then we go back with a new formal proposal before the trip out there that says what they want can be done through including Samsung pay in play billing and show some mocks?

On Thu, Jun 6, 2019, 7:02 AM Christopher Li <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
 Yes, will set up the conversation with Jay at around 4 or 5 PM today - we had put a hold for this meeting just in case. Please let us know if either of you would like to join - otherwise, Jim and I can take the call and mirror the messaging on this thread.

 Christopher Li
 Android - Platform
 lichristopher@google.com
 [REDACTED]

EXHIBIT 785

On Thu, Jun 6, 2019 at 6:49 AM Jamie Rosenberg <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:
 +Christopher Li

We were shooting for a call today but it turned out that Patrick would be flying at that time. I caught him in an airport for a brief conversation last night, after which Patrick asked us (or a subset) to have a longer conversation with Jay to walk through our feedback in detail.

I landed the points of our feedback... focused on the fact that while their proposal might have reduced fragmentation in the developer operational workflow, it maintained or exacerbated fragmentation in consumer experience and developer commercial workflow. And that it created an incentive dynamic where the store teams would be competing with each other. (and developers playing us off against each other) I pointed out to him that their proposal seemed to be the best of both worlds for Samsung -- reduced operational burden, strengthening their ability to build their own business.

Patrick said he understood the points, and that while our original proposal did a better job addressing those points, it did not give them a vehicle to build direct relationships with user, or to build payment relationships. He said that while payment relationships for games was not an end in and of itself, games IAP was the best vehicle they had to get these relationships established.

He then posited "well, maybe we create a governance model that mitigates the teams competing with each other dynamic -- rules of engagement, limitations, etc." I said that felt hard and that we had thought more about structural ways to make the teams more naturally aligned. I mentioned the Samsung Pay as a FOP idea. He reacted positively to that, thought it was an elegant solution, encouraged us to share more details with Jay and team. He said if we did that as well as revenue share, it would be a stronger proposal for them to consider. (I was non-committal on revenue share).

Finally, I said "at some point you and DJ need to decide what you're optimizing for." He latched onto that immediately and said, "I know, and I've mentioned to DJ that in order for us to do something big with Google, we need to be mindful of the three areas that are important to you guys: Search, Store and Assistant. As long as we're out of alignment in those areas, bigger conversations are difficult." He said he feels that we need to be having much more strategic conversations between the companies. I said I agree, but you need to understand this is a threshold issue for us. He totally got that.

As a next step, I'd suggest that this group (or a subset) have the same conversation with Jay later today if possible and walk him through our feedback and counterproposal in more detail. Patrick said he was going to give Jay a heads up as well. Chris or Jim, would you guys help arrange that?

Among us we need to decide when we start to bring rev share into the conversation, but 1) I don't think we should do that outside the context of RSA and 2) I get the impression Hiroshi wants to grind them a bit on the rev share concept [i.e., suggest they share from their device business, etc.]. We can mention that this afternoon.

On Thu, Jun 6, 2019 at 12:37 AM Sameer Samat <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

Hi jamie -- there was a call on the cal for tomorrow with samsung but erin tells me it's gone now. Are you reaching out to patrick separately? Happy to support in anyway.

sameer

GOOG-PLAY-004787227**Metadata**

All Custodians	Jamie Rosenberg;Jim Kolotouros;Sameer Samat;Tian Lim	SEMANTIC
Author	jimk	SEMANTIC
Cc	tia [REDACTED]@google.com>;jamie rosenberg <[REDACTED]@google.com>;christopher li <[REDACTED]@google.com>	SEMANTIC
Confidentiality	CONFIDENTIAL	SEMANTIC
Custodian	Tian Lim	SEMANTIC
Date Modified	06/06/2019 8:22 pm	SEMANTIC
Date Sent	06/06/2019 8:22 pm	SEMANTIC
Extension	eml	SEMANTIC
File Size	19739	SEMANTIC
From	jim kolotouros <[REDACTED]@google.com>	SEMANTIC
MD5 Hash	5C3B86B967139792FEA9D9A9E8A0D4E4	SEMANTIC
Message Id	<CAEkp2j0v1RQKmQe8m6VT71OSE_+B08hqVKCUTM_-vUgc9vZdrw@mail.gmail.com>	SEMANTIC
Parent Date	06/06/2019 8:22 pm	SEMANTIC
Primary Date	06/06/2019 8:22 pm	DOC_TYP E_ALIAS
Production Volume	PROD018	SEMANTIC
Record Type	E-mail	SEMANTIC
Redacted	No	SEMANTIC
Subject	Re: samsung next steps	SEMANTIC
Time Zone	UTC	SEMANTIC
Title	Re: samsung next steps	SEMANTIC
To	sameer samat <[REDACTED]@google.com>	SEMANTIC